APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/428,384	10/28/1999	STEPHEN WILLARD DICKSON	200308268-1	4583

22879   7590   06/13/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/13/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/428,384	DICKSON, STEPHEN WILLARD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ANH LY	2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02/21/2008*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 October 1999* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is response to Applicant's AMENDMENT filed on 02/21/2008.

2.   Claims 1- 40 are pending this Application.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 19, 20, 21, 27, 30, 33

and 36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 19, 20, 21, 21, 27, 30, 33 and 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.: US 6,385,658 B2 issued to Harter,

Jr. et al. (hereinafter Harter) in view of Patent No.: US 5,355,477 issued to Strickland et

al. (hereinafter STRICKLAND).

With respect to claim 1, HARTER teaches a computerized data file system (fig.

2A, data structure containing a plurality of files or file system: col. 4, lines 18-30 and

lines 55-62), comprising:

a first process that maintains a data file in a computer-readable memory (the

process in fig. 1 Process A is the first process to access files or messages stored in the

memory, fig. 1, item 30);

a second process that generates a first message requesting that said second

process be granted by said first process a plurality of tokens required for said second

process to modify at least one characteristic of said file stored in said computer-

readable memory (the second process is Process B, issue the first message to the

shared list stored in the memory, fig. 1, item 30, the shared list includes a plurality of

messages, each one as a token for both process A and B to access or manipulate the

files or messages stored on the shared memory: col. 1, lines 32-45, col. 2, lines 55-65

and col. 7, lines 65-67),

said first process generating a second message, in response to said first

message, that grants said tokens to said second process if said tokens are available for

grant to said second process and as maintained by said first process in said computer-

readable memory without said second process receiving a copy of said data file (the

process A or first process sending the message in response to the received message

from the second process if the message is available for accessing or manipulating: (figs.

3 and 7, col. 6, lines 6-24 and lines 45-60 and col. 9, lines 60-67 and col. 10, lines 1-

15).

HARTER teaches Process A and Process B as first process and second

process, both are sending and transmitting the messages or token messages stored in

the memory. HARTER does not explicitly teaches if said tokens are granted, said

second process modifying the at least one characteristic of said data file as claimed.

However, STRICKLAND teaches two or more processes may concurrently

update different records in the same CI, using only a record-level lock and if a second

process has updated or modified without a single data control block and the message is received it (abstract, lines 11-16; col. 1, lines 45-54 and col. 3, lines 8-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of HARTER with the teachings of STRICKLAND. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of second process for modifying or updating the information or data as disclosed (STRICKLAND's abstract), into the system of HARTER for the purpose for concurrent record updating without a single data control Interval or block without lock contention at the block level (STRICKLAND's col. 1, lines 12-15).

With respect to claim 6, HARTER teaches computer nodes (fig. 1, item 12a – 12c, are computer nodes), comprising:

a first process residing in the node that generates a first message that grants a set of tokens, if the set of tokens is available for grant, to a second process that requested grant of the set of tokens, the set of tokens being required for the second process to be able to modify at least one characteristic of a file stored in a computer-readable memory within the computer node (the process in fig. 1 Process A is the first process to access files or messages stored in the memory, fig. 1, item 30; the second process is Process B, issue the first message to the shared list stored in the memory, fig. 1, item 30, the shared list includes a plurality of messages, each one as a token for both process A and B to access or manipulate the files or messages stored on the shared memory: col. 1, lines 32-45, col. 2, lines 55-65 and col. 7, lines 65-67; and the process A or first process sending the message in response to the received message

from the second process if the message is available for accessing or manipulating: figs. 3 and 7, col. 6, lines 6-24 and lines 45-60 and col. 9, lines 60-67 and col. 10, lines 1-15).

HARTER teaches Process A and Process B as first process and second process, both are sending and transmitting the messages or token messages stored in the memory. HARTER does not explicitly teaches if the second process receives the set of tokens, the second process modifying the at least one characteristic of the file without receiving a copy of the file as claimed.

However, STRICKLAND teaches two or more processes may concurrently update different records in the same CI, using only a record-level lock and if a second process has updated or modified without a single data control block and the message is received it (abstract, lines 11-16; col. 1, lines 45-54 and col. 3, lines 8-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of HARTER with the teachings of STRICKLAND. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of second process for modifying or updating the information or data as disclosed (STRICKLAND's abstract), into the system of HARTER for the purpose for concurrent record updating without a single data control Interval or block without lock contention at the block level (STRICKLAND's col. 1, lines 12-15).

With respect to claim 11, HARTER teaches a computer node, comprising a first process residing in said node that generates a request to a second process for grant of a set of tokens required to enable the first process to modify at least one characteristic

of a tile residing in a remote computer-readable memory (computer nodes: fig. 1, item

12a – 12c, are computer nodes; the process in fig. 1 Process A is the first process to

access files or messages stored in the memory, fig. 1, item 30; the second process is

Process B, issue the first message to the shared list stored in the memory, fig. 1, item

30, the shared list includes a plurality of messages, each one as a token for both

process A and B to access or manipulate the files or messages stored on the shared

memory: col. 1, lines 32-45, col. 2, lines 55-65 and col. 7, lines 65-67; and the process

A or first process sending the message in response to the received message from the

second process if the message is available for accessing or manipulating: figs. 3 and 7,

col. 6, lines 6-24 and lines 45-60 and col. 9, lines 60-67 and col. 10, lines 1-15).

HARTER teaches Process A and Process B as first process and second

process, both are sending and transmitting the messages or token messages stored in

the memory. HARTER does not explicitly teach if the first process receives the set of

tokens, the first process modifying the at least one characteristic of the file residing in

the remote computer-readable memory without receiving a copy of the file as claimed.

However, STRICKLAND teaches two or more processes may concurrently

update different records in the same CI, using only a record-level lock and if a second

process has updated or modified without a single data control block and the message is

received it (abstract, lines 11-16; col. 1, lines 45-54 and col. 3, lines 8-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of HARTER with the teachings

of STRICKLAND. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to

utilize the use of second process for modifying or updating the information or data as

disclosed (STRICKLAND's abstract), into the system of HARTER for the purpose for

concurrent record updating without a single data control Interval or block without lock

contention at the block level (STRICKLAND's col. 1, lines 12-15).

With respect to claim 14, HARTER teaches a network computer system (fig. 1,

col. 4, lines 18-47), comprising:

a first computer node having a data file stored in a computer-readable memory;

and a second computer node that issues to the first computer node a first message

requesting pant of a set of tokens required to carry out a modification of at least one

characteristic of said file stored in the first computer node; the first computer node

issuing a second message to the second computer node after receipt of the first

message, the second message granting the set of tokens to the first process if the set of

tokens is available for grant to the second process (computer nodes: fig. 1, item 12a –

12c, are computer nodes; the process in fig. 1 Process A is the first process to access

files or messages stored in the memory, fig. 1, item 30; the second process is Process

B, issue the first message to the shared list stored in the memory, fig. 1, item 30, the

shared list includes a plurality of messages, each one as a token for both process A and

B to access or manipulate the files or messages stored on the shared memory: col. 1,

lines 32-45, col. 2, lines 55-65 and col. 7, lines 65-67; and the process A or first process

sending the message in response to the received message from the second process if

the message is available for accessing or manipulating: figs. 3 and 7, col. 6, lines 6-24

and lines 45-60 and col. 9, lines 60-67 and col. 10, lines 1-15).

HARTER teaches Process A and Process B as first process and second

process, both are sending and transmitting the messages or token messages stored in

the memory. HARTER does not explicitly teach if the set of tokens are granted, the

second computer node modifying the at least one characteristic of the file stored in the

first computer node without the second computer node receiving a copy of the file as

claimed.

However, STRICKLAND teaches two or more processes may concurrently

update different records in the same CI, using only a record-level lock and if a second

process has updated or modified without a single data control block and the message is

received it (abstract, lines 11-16; col. 1, lines 45-54 and col. 3, lines 8-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of HARTER with the teachings

of STRICKLAND. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to

utilize the use of second process for modifying or updating the information or data as

disclosed (STRICKLAND's abstract), into the system of HARTER for the purpose for

concurrent record updating without a single data control Interval or block without lock

contention at the block level (STRICKLAND's col. 1, lines 12-15).

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a

computer-readable memory containing computer-executable program instructions rather

than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to

the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a computer-readable memory containing computer-executable program instructions rather than a computer node, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Claim 21 is essentially the same as claim 11 except that it is directed to a computer-readable memory containing computer-executable program instructions rather than a computer node, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 11 hereinabove.

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer data file system with means for rather than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 30 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a method rather than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 33 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a method rather than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Claim 36 is essentially the same as claim 11 except that it is directed to a method rather than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 11 hereinabove.

6.   Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-13, 15-18, 22-26, 28-29, 31-32, 34-35 and 37-40 rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.: US 6,385,658 B2

issued to Harter, Jr. et al. (hereinafter Harter) in view of Patent No.: US 5,355,477

issued to Strickland et al. (hereinafter STRICKLAND) and further in view of Patent No.

US 5,634,122 issued to Loucks et al. (hereafter LOUCKS).

With respect to claim 2-5 and 38, HARTER in view of STRICKLAND discloses a

system as discussed in claim 1.

HARTER and STRICKLAND disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

HARTER and STRICKLAND do not explicitly teach said first process is resident

at a server computer node, and said second process is resident at a client computer

node; if any of said tokens are unavailable for grant to said second process as a result

of current grant of said tokens to at least one other process, said first process generates

a third message revoking the current grant of said tokens to said at least one other

process; said at least one other process, in response to said third message, generates

a fourth message making said tokens available for grant by said first process; and said

first process resides in a first computer node; said second process resides in a second

computer node; said at least one other process resides in at least one other computer

node; and said first computer, second computer, and at least one other computer nodes

are networked together and are remote from each other; and wherein: said second

process, in response to receiving said second message, modifies said at least one

characteristic of said file stored in said computer-readable memory as claimed.

However, LOUCKS teaches client machine and server machine (see fig. 3 and

fig. 5, col. 5, lines 7-10 and col. 7, lines 32-40); third message and tokens are

unavailable grant to the second process (abstract, col. 6, line 8-40 and col. 7, lines 52-

67); fourth message for grant by first process (abstract and col. 6, lines 8-40) and

client/server architecture network with network file system and distributing file system

(see fig. 3 and 5); and tokens represent an authorization for a process to perform a

certain function, e.g., a "read" token permit client to read data while a "write" token

permits the client to update data (col. 6, lines 8-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of HARTER in view of

STRICKLAND with the teachings of LOUCKS by incorporating the use of subsequent

messages and client/server architecture as disclosed (LOUCKS's abstract and col. 6,

lines 8-40), into the system of HARTER for the purpose of tokens representing an

authorization for a process to perform a certain function, e.g., a "read" token permit

client to read data while a "write" token permits the client to update data (LOUCKS' col.

6, lines 8-15).

With respect to claim 7-10, HARTER in view of STRICKLAND discloses a

computer node as discussed in claim 6.

HARTER and STRICKLAND disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

HARTER and STRICKLAND do not explicitly teach each of the processes

resides in a respective one of computer nodes; one of the processes resides in a server

computer node and the other of the processes resides in a client computer node; if at

least one token in the set of tokens is unavailable for grant because the at least one

token is currently granted to a third process, that revokes current grant of the at least

one token to the third process prior to generating the first message the first message is

generated by the first process in response to a request for the grant of the set of tokens

generated by the second process and wherein the first message is generated by the

first process in response to a request for the grant of the set of tokens generated by the

second process, the request specifying all tokens required for the second process to be

able to modify the at least one characteristic of the file as claimed.

However, LOUCKS teaches one of the processes resides in a server computer

node and the other of the processes resides in a client computer node, first process and

second process resides in the computer node (see fig. 3 and fig. 5, client machine and

server machine; col. 5, lines 7-10 and col. 7, lines 32-40) and granting tokens such as

read or write token: col. 2, lines 18-25; col. 6, lines 50-67 and col. 7, lines 1-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of HARTER in view of

STRICKLAND with the teachings of LOUCKS by incorporating the use of subsequent

messages and client/server architecture as disclosed (LOUCKS's abstract and col. 6,

lines 8-40), into the system of HARTER for the purpose of tokens representing an

authorization for a process to perform a certain function, e.g., a "read" token permit

client to read data while a "write" token permits the client to update data (LOUCKS' col.

6, lines 8-15).

With respect to claim 12-13, HARTER in view of STRICKLAND discloses a computer node as discussed in claim 11.

HARTER and STRICKLAND disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

HARTER and STRICKLAND do not explicitly teach the second process resides in a second computer node, and the memory is comprised in said second node and wherein: the set of tokens comprises all tokens required for the first process to be able to modify the at least one characteristic of the file as claimed.

However, LOUCKS teaches second process resides in the second computer node (see fig. 3 and fig. 5, client machine and server machine; col. 5, lines 7-10 and col. 7, lines 32-40) and set of tokens (col. 6, lines 8-35 and col. 8, lines 32-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of HARTER in view of STRICKLAND with the teachings of LOUCKS by incorporating the use of subsequent messages and client/server architecture as disclosed (LOUCKS's abstract and col. 6, lines 8-40), into the system of HARTER for the purpose of tokens representing an authorization for a process to perform a certain function, e.g., a "read" token permit client to read data while a "write" token permits the client to update data (LOUCKS' col. 6, lines 8-15).

With respect to claim 15-18, HARTER in view of STRICKLAND discloses a network computer system as discussed in claim 14.

HARTER and STRICKLAND disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

HARTER and STRICKLAND do not explicitly teach the first computer node is a

server node, and the second computer node is a non-server node; the set of tokens

comprises all tokens required to carry out the modification of the at least one

characteristic of the file; wherein: if at least one token in the set of tokens is unavailable

for the grant because the at least one token is currently granted, the first computer node

waits to issue the first message until after the first computer node receives a third

message from a third computer node indicating relinquishment of current rant of the at

least one token and wherein: the at least one token comprises a plurality of tokens as

claimed.

However, LOUCKS teaches server node and client node (see fig. 3 and fig. 5,

client machine and server machine; col. 5, lines 7-10 and col. 7, lines 32-40); tokens

represent an authorization for a process to perform a certain function, e.g., a "read"

token permit client to read data while a "write" token permits the client to update data:

col. 6, lines 8-15; the computer node receives a third message from a third computer

node (figs. 4, 7-8, col. 6, lines 28-35 and col. 9, lines 60-67 and col. 10, lines 1-54); and

client cache manager requests Open-Read and Open-Write tokens when it mounts the

first set (col. 8, lines 35-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of HARTER in view of

STRICKLAND with the teachings of LOUCKS by incorporating the use of subsequent

messages and client/server architecture as disclosed (LOUCKS's abstract and col. 6,

lines 8-40), into the system of HARTER for the purpose of tokens representing an

authorization for a process to perform a certain function, e.g., a "read" token permit

client to read data while a "write" token permits the client to update data (LOUCKS' col.

6, lines 8-15).

Claim 22 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a

computer-readable memory containing computer-executable program instructions rather

than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to

the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 23 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a

computer-readable memory containing computer-executable program instructions rather

than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to

the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 24 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it is directed to a

computer-readable memory containing computer-executable program instructions rather

than a computer node, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 9

hereinabove.

Claim 25 is essentially the same as claim 10 except that it is directed to a

computer-readable memory containing computer-executable program instructions rather

than a computer node, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 10

hereinabove.

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 13 except that it is directed to a

computer-readable memory containing computer-executable program instructions rather

than a computer node, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 13 hereinabove.

Claim 28 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system rather than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 29 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system rather than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 31 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a method rather than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 32 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a method rather than a computerized data file system , and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 34 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it is directed to a method rather than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 9 hereinabove.

Claim 35 is essentially the same as claim 10 except that it is directed to a method rather than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 10 hereinabove.

Claim 37 is essentially the same as claim 13 except that it is directed to a method rather than a computerized data file system, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 13 hereinabove.

With respect to claims 39-40, HARTER in view of STRICKLAND discloses a system and method as discussed in claim 27 and 30 respectively.

HARTER and STRICKLAND disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

HARTER and STRICKLAND do not explicitly teach means for modifying said at least one characteristic of said file stored in said computer-readable memory and modifying said at least one characteristic of said file stored in said computer-readable memory as claimed.

However, LOUCKS teaches tokens represent an authorization for a process to perform a certain function, e.g., a "read" token permit client to read data while a "write" token permits the client to update data (col. 6, lines 8-15) and client cache manager requests Open-Read and Open-Write tokens when it mounts the first set (col. 8, lines 35-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of HARTER in view of STRICKLAND with the teachings of LOUCKS by incorporating the use of subsequent messages and client/server architecture as disclosed (LOUCKS's abstract and col. 6, lines 8-40), into the system of HARTER for the purpose of tokens representing an authorization for a process to perform a certain function, e.g., a "read" token permit

client to read data while a "write" token permits the client to update data (LOUCKS' col.

6, lines 8-15).

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ANH LY whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or

via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV (Written Authorization being given by Applicant

(MPEP 502.03 [R-2])) or fax to **(571) 273-4039** (unofficial fax number directly to

examiner's office). The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY

from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John Breene**, can be reached on **(571) 272-

4107** or Primary Examiner, **Jean Fleurantin**, can be reached on **(571) 272-4035**.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed

to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to:

Central Fax Center: (571) 273-8300.

ANH LY /AL/
JUN. 1st, 2008

/JEAN B. FLEURANTIN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162